



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,133	08/10/2001	Russell Andrew Fink	00-4045	6468
32127	7590	09/10/2007		
VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 500 ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909			EXAMINER TESLOVICH, TAMARA	
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@VERIZON.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/928,133

Applicant(s)

FINK ET AL.

Examiner

Tamara Teslovich

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 25-32 is/are pending in the application.
 - Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 25-32 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - ☐ All
 - ☐ Some *
 - ☐ None of:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (F-TO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 26, 2007 has been entered.

Claims 21-24 are cancelled.

Claims 1-6, 11, 16, 25-32 are amended.

Claims 1-20 and 25-32 are pending and herein considered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's remarks and amendments, filed June 26, 2006, with respect to Applicant's use of the phrase "configured to" have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration and in view of Applicant's amendments, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Applicant's arguments with respect to Examiner's 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 1-20 and 25-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-20 and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Newly amended claims 1-20 and 25-32 rely upon the use of translators or the means thereof, to "detranslate" predetermined portions of packet header information. First, the Examiner would like to point out that she is unfamiliar with the use of such a term within the fields of art applicable to the instant invention. Furthermore she has been unable to find such a word or variation thereof in any dictionary related to the art or otherwise. Secondly, the Examiner has thoroughly examined the specification for a definition of the term that would suggest that the Applicant intends to be his own lexicographer, but has been unable to find any section therein explaining what exactly is meant by such a term. Throughout the specification, there appears only a handful of references to any kind of "detranslating," it is the Examiner's belief that not a one of these references discloses exactly what is meant by the term. As such, the Examiner is

Art Unit: 2137

unable to ascertain exactly how one goes about "detranslating" or the result of such a "detranslation" and therefore is unable to make or use the invention as described.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-20 and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Newly amended claims 1-20 and 25-32 rely upon the use of translators or the means thereof, to "detranslate" predetermined portions of packet header information. The use of such a phrase is indefinite for the following reasons. First, the Examiner would like to point out once again that she is unfamiliar with the use of such a term within the fields of art applicable to the instant invention. Furthermore she has been unable to find such a word or variation thereof in any dictionary related to the art or otherwise. Additionally, although the Examiner has thoroughly examined the specification for a definition of the term that would suggest that the Applicant intends to be his own lexicographer, she has been unable to find any section therein explaining what exactly is to be meant by such a term. Throughout the specification, there appears only a handful of references to any kind of "detranslating," it is the Examiner's belief that not a one of these references discloses exactly what is meant by the term.

Art Unit: 2137

As such, the Examiner is unable to ascertain the metes and bounds of Applicant's use of the terms "detranslating," "detranslate," "detranslatable," and "detranslated."

Examiner's Note

Because the claims are rendered indefinite by the several issues detailed above in reference to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, both first and second paragraphs, it has not been possible to determine the scope of the claims, and therefore it has not been possible to fully search the prior art for the claimed subject matter in order to make a determination regarding the patentability of the claims with respect to novelty under 35 U.S.C. 102 and non-obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103. A search has been made to the extent possible, and documents which appear to be relevant are cited below.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

"Multiple-Entry Key Look-Aside Table for Bulk Cryptographic Functions", IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin. Volume 36. Issue 11. Pages 437-442. November 1993.


US Patent Application Publication 2003/0130909 entitled "Purchasing Aid Logistics Appliance"

Art Unit: 2137

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamara Teslovich whose telephone number is (571) 272-4241. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



T. Teslovich



EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER